

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: 2207/13282
Intel Corporation

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 10, 13, and 16 have been amended to put them into better form. Reconsideration of the rejection of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: 2207/13282
Intel Corporation

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. As to claim 13, this claim has been amended to recite that the at least one AMAAC kernel and the at least one MAAC kernel are coupled together to perform downsampling computations. As to claim 16, this claim has been amended to indicate that the at least one MAAC kernel and the at least one AMAAC kernel are coupled together and a switching fabric is provided to configure them. The Office Action states that claim 16 fails to recite the necessary detail to perform the recited function(s). Claim 16 does not describe a function, it recites a digital signal processor that includes three components. MPEP 2172.01 requires inclusion of subject matter "disclosed to be essential to the invention as described in the specification." The specification is quite clear that an embodiment of applicant's invention is to include a plurality of adders and multipliers configured as MAAC and AMAAC kernels in a digital signal processor (see, e.g., p. 3, line 32 to p. 4, line 5 of the present application). If there are additional elements for claim 16 that are essential as required by MPEP 2172.01, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide support from the specification (or elsewhere) that "essential" elements have been omitted from the claims. In view of the amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

The Claims Are Allowable Over the Prior Art

Claims 10-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,526,430 to Hung et al. ("Hung"). Claims 10-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: 2207/13282
Intel Corporation

103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,594,679 to Iwata ("Iwata"). Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

With respect to Hung, the Office Action points to the presence of adders and multipliers shown in Fig. 10. Looking at Figure 10 of Hung, two inputs are supplied to adders/subtractors 310, the output is supplied to a multiplier 314 where it is multiplied with a coefficient. The result is then sent to an additional adder 318. Claim 10 recites that the MAAC and AMAAC kernels are to be used to compute an IDCT in one of a downsampling mode and a non-downsampling mode. Hung does not teach or suggest this feature. The Abstract of Hung simply states that the coprocessor can be used to perform filtering with downsampling. There is nothing else in Hung as to how such downsampling is performed. Claim 13 also recites the performance of downsampling computations. This claim also describes a register block in the MAAC and AMAAC that provides an output to a third input of an adder. Though adders and multipliers are shown in Hung, this feature is neither shown nor suggested by Hung as well. As to claim 16, as amended, Hung does not show or suggest a switching fabric to configure the at least one MAAC and the at least one AMAAC.

With respect to Iwata, the Office Action points to the presence of arithmetic logic units and multipliers shown in Fig. 6. With the amendment to claim 10, Applicant reiterates that Iwata does not show computing an IDCT in one of a downsampling mode and non-downsampling mode. Claim 13 also recites the performance of downsampling computations. This claim also describes a register block in the MAAC and AMAAC that provides an output to a third input of an adder. Though ALUs and multipliers are shown in Iwata, this feature is neither shown nor suggested by Iwata as well. As to claim 16,

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: 2207/13282
Intel Corporation

as amended, Hung does not show or suggest a switching fabric to configure the at least one MAAC and the at least one AMAAC as called for in the claim.

Since features of claim 10-18 are neither shown nor suggested by the Hung or Iwata references, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendments and favorable action in connection with this application.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 or credit any overpayment to Kenyon and Kenyon Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON



Shawn W. O'Dowd
Registration No. 34,687
Attorney for Intel Corporation

Date: December 7, 2005

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K Street, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Ph.: (202) 220-4200
Fax.: (202) 220-4201
DC1-592744